arXiv:math/0207273v2 [math.GR] 30 Jan 2005

How close are pth powers in the Nottingham group?

Kevin Keating
Department of Mathematics
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611
USA

`keating@math.ufl.edu`

Abstract

Let F be a field of characteristic $p > 0$ and let f, g be elements of the Nottingham group $\mathcal{N}(F)$ such that f has depth k and gf^{-1} has depth $n \geq k$. We find the best possible lower bound for the depth of $g^p f^{-p}$.

Let R be a commutative ring with 1 which has characteristic $p > 0$, and let $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}(R)$ denote the Nottingham group over R. Thus $\mathcal{N}$ is the set of all formal power series $f(x) \in R[[x]]$ with leading term x, and the product of $f, g \in \mathcal{N}$ is defined to be $(fg)(x) = f(g(x))$. For each $k \geq 1$ define a normal subgroup $\mathcal{N}_k \trianglelefteq \mathcal{N}$ by setting

$$\mathcal{N}_k = \{f \in \mathcal{N} : f(x) \equiv x \pmod{x^{k+1}}\}. \tag{1}$$

The depth of $f \in \mathcal{N}$ is defined to be $D(f) = \sup\{k : f \in \mathcal{N}_k\}$.

Let $n \geq k \geq 1$ and let k_0 be the least nonnegative residue of k modulo p. We define a nonnegative integer $e(k, n)$ as follows:

$$e(k,n) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } p \mid k \text{ and } n = k, \\ 1 & \text{if } p \mid k,\ p \mid n, \text{ and } n > k, \\ 0 & \text{if } p \mid k \text{ and } p \nmid n, \\ i & \text{if } p \nmid k \text{ and } n \equiv 2k - i \pmod{p} \text{ for some } 0 \leq i \leq k_0, \\ k_0 & \text{if } p \nmid k \text{ and } n \not\equiv 2k - i \pmod{p} \text{ for all } 0 \leq i \leq k_0. \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

Our main result is the following:

Theorem 1 *(a) Let f and g be elements of $\mathcal{N}(R)$ such that $D(f) \geq k$ and $D(gf^{-1}) \geq n$. Then*

$$D(g^p f^{-p}) \geq n + (p-1)k + e(k,n). \tag{3}$$

(b) There exist $f, g \in \mathcal{N}(R)$ such that $D(f) = k$, $D(gf^{-1}) = n$, and

$$D(g^p f^{-p}) = n + (p-1)k + e(k,n). \tag{4}$$

The following corollary generalizes Theorem 1(a) to higher powers of p. It would be interesting to know whether the bound given here is the best possible.

Corollary 2 *Let $f, g \in \mathcal{N}(R)$ be such that $D(f) \geq k$ and $D(gf^{-1}) \geq n$. Then for all $m \geq 1$ we have*

$$D(g^{p^m} f^{-p^m}) \geq n + (p^m - 1)k + \frac{p^m - p}{p-1}k_0 + e(k,n). \tag{5}$$

Proof: By repeated application of Lemma 5 below we get

$$D(f^{p^i}) \geq p^i k + \frac{p^i - 1}{p-1}k_0 \tag{6}$$

for all $i \geq 1$. It follows from (2) that

$$n + (p-1)k + e(k,n) \equiv \begin{cases} n \pmod{p} & \text{if } e(k,n) = k_0, \\ k \pmod{p} & \text{if } 0 \leq e(k,n) < k_0, \\ 1 \pmod{p} & \text{if } p \mid k,\ p \mid n, \text{ and } n > k. \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

Using (3), (6), and (7) we can iteratively compute lower bounds for $D(g^{p^i} f^{-p^i})$. For $i \geq 1$ we get $D(g^{p^i} f^{-p^i}) \geq d_i$, where $d_1 = n + (p-1)k + e(k,n)$ and

$$d_{i+1} = d_i + (p-1)\left(p^i k + \frac{p^i - 1}{p-1}k_0\right) + k_0. \tag{8}$$

By summing the terms we get

$$d_m = n + (p^m - 1)k + \frac{p^m - p}{p-1}k_0 + e(k,n), \tag{9}$$

as required. □

Let S be a commutative ring with 1 which has characteristic p and let $\sigma : R \to S$ be a unitary ring homomorphism. Then σ induces a group homomorphism $\mathcal{N}(R) \to \mathcal{N}(S)$ which we denote by $f \mapsto f^\sigma$. We clearly have $D(f^\sigma) \geq D(f)$. Let $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{F}_p[r_k, r_{k+1}, \ldots, s_n, s_{n+1}, \ldots]$, where $\mathbb{F}_p = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ is the field with p elements and r_i, s_j are variables. Also set

$$\mathbf{f}(x) = x + r_k x^{k+1} + r_{k+1}x^{k+2} + \cdots \tag{10}$$
$$\mathbf{u}_1(x) = x + s_n x^{n+1} + s_{n+1}x^{n+2} + \cdots \tag{11}$$

and $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{u}_1\mathbf{f}$. Then $\mathbf{f}$ is a generic element of $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{R})$ of depth k, and $\mathbf{u}_1$ is a generic element of $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{R})$ of depth n.

Let $f, g \in \mathcal{N}(R)$ satisfy $D(f) \geq k$ and $D(gf^{-1}) \geq n$. Then we have

$$f(x) = x + a_k x^{k+1} + a_{k+1}x^{k+2} + \cdots \tag{12}$$
$$gf^{-1}(x) = x + b_n x^{n+1} + b_{n+1}x^{n+2} + \cdots \tag{13}$$

with $a_i, b_j \in R$. Let $\sigma : \mathcal{R} \to R$ be the unique homomorphism such that $\sigma(r_i) = a_i$ for $i \geq k$ and $\sigma(s_j) = b_j$ for $j \geq n$. Then $\mathbf{f}^\sigma = f$, $(\mathbf{g}\mathbf{f}^{-1})^\sigma = gf^{-1}$, and hence $\mathbf{g}^\sigma = g$. Therefore to prove Theorem 1(a) it suffices to show

$$D(\mathbf{g}^p\mathbf{f}^{-p}) \geq n + (p-1)k + e(k,n). \tag{14}$$

Since $\mathbb{F}_p$ is a subring of every ring of characteristic p, it suffices to prove Theorem 1(b) in the case $R = \mathbb{F}_p$. We define a specialization to be a homomorphism $\sigma : \mathcal{R} \to \mathbb{F}_p$. Associated to a specialization σ we have elements $\mathbf{f}^\sigma$, $\mathbf{g}^\sigma$, $\mathbf{u}_1^\sigma$ of $\mathcal{N}(\mathbb{F}_p)$.

Remark 3 Theorem 1 can be expressed entirely in terms of the generic power series $\mathbf{f}(x)$. Theorem 1(a) is equivalent to the statement that for all $i \leq n + (p-1)k + e(k,n)$ the coefficient of x^i in $\mathbf{f}^p(x)$ does not depend on any r_j with $j \geq n$. Theorem 1(b) is equivalent to the statement that there exist specializations σ, τ such that $\sigma(r_j) = \tau(r_j)$ for $k \leq j < n$, $\sigma(r_n) \neq \tau(r_n)$, and $D((\mathbf{f}^\tau)^p(\mathbf{f}^\sigma)^{-p}) = n + (p-1)k + e(k,n)$. □

The following lemma is useful in the proof of Theorem 1(b):

Lemma 4 *Suppose there are $n' > n \geq k$ such that Theorem 1(a) holds for (k,n), Theorem 1(b) holds for (k,n'), and*

$$n + (p-1)k + e(k,n) = n' + (p-1)k + e(k,n'). \tag{15}$$

Then Theorem 1(b) holds for (k,n).

Proof: Since Theorem 1(b) holds for (k,n') there are $f, g \in \mathcal{N}(R)$ such that $D(f) = k$, $D(gf^{-1}) = n'$, and $D(g^pf^{-p}) = n + (p-1)k + e(k,n)$. Choose $h \in \mathcal{N}(R)$ such that $D(hf^{-1}) = n$. Then we have

$$D(h^pf^{-p}) \geq D(\mathbf{g}^p\mathbf{f}^{-p}) \geq n + (p-1)k + e(k,n). \tag{16}$$

If $D(h^pf^{-p}) = n + (p-1)k + e(k,n)$ then f, h satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1(b). If $D(h^pf^{-p}) > n + (p-1)k + e(k,n)$ then $D(h^pg^{-p}) = n + (p-1)k + e(k,n)$, $D(g) = k$, and $D(hg^{-1}) = n$. Therefore g, h satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1(b). □

The proof of Theorem 1 proceeds by cases, depending mainly on the relative sizes of k and n. We start with the cases where n is small. We first require a lemma.

Lemma 5 $D(\mathbf{f}^p) = pk + k_0$.

Proof: If $p \geq 3$ then the result follows from [1, Th. 6], while if $p = 2$ and k is even then it follows from [1, Lemma 1]. If $p = 2$ and k is odd then by an explicit calculation we get $\mathbf{f}^2(x) = x + (r_1r_2 + r_1^3)x^4 + O(x^5)$ if $k = 1$, and $\mathbf{f}^2(x) = x + r_kr_{k+1}x^{2k+2} + O(x^{2k+3})$ if $k \geq 3$, which implies the result. □

Case 1 *Theorem 1 holds if $k \leq n \leq k + k_0$.*

Proof: For n in this range we have $e(k,n) = k + k_0 - n$. By Lemma 5 we have

$$D(\mathbf{f}^p) = D(\mathbf{g}^p) = pk + k_0 = n + (p-1)k + e(k,n). \tag{17}$$

It follows that $D(\mathbf{g}^p\mathbf{f}^{-p}) \geq n + (p-1)k + e(k,n)$, which proves Theorem 1(a). To prove Theorem 1(b) we first consider the case $n = k + k_0$. Set $f(x) = x + x^{k+1}$, $u(x) = x + x^{k+k_0+1}$, and $g = uf$, so that $D(gf^{-1}) = D(u) = k + k_0$. If $p \mid k$ then $k_0 = 0$ and $u = f$, so by [1, Lemma 1] we have $D(g^pf^{-p}) = D(f^p) = pk$. If $p \geq 3$ and $p \nmid k$ then by the third paragraph in the proof of [1, Th. 6] we have $D(g^pf^{-p}) = pk + k_0$. If $p = 2$ and n is odd then by the explicit computations in the proof of Lemma 5 we get $D(g^2f^{-2}) = 2k + 1 = pk + k_0$. Thus Theorem 1(b) holds when $n = k + k_0$. It follows from Lemma 4 that Theorem 1(b) also holds for $k \leq n < k + k_0$. □

We next consider the cases where $n \geq (p-1)k + p$. We will need the following basic result, which is proved in [1, Prop. 1].

Lemma 6 *Let R be an integral domain of characteristic p, let $f, g \in \mathcal{N}(R)$, and let $[f,g] = f^{-1}g^{-1}fg$ denote the commutator of f with g. Then $D([f,g]) \geq D(f) + D(g)$, with equality if and only if $D(f) \not\equiv D(g) \pmod{p}$.*

Recall that $\mathbf{u}_1 = \mathbf{g}\mathbf{f}^{-1} \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{R})$, and define $\mathbf{u}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_p$ inductively by setting $\mathbf{u}_{i+1} = [\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{f}]$. By Lemma 6 we have $D(\mathbf{u}_{i+1}) \geq D(\mathbf{u}_i) + D(\mathbf{f})$; since $D(\mathbf{u}_1) = n$ this implies $D(\mathbf{u}_i) \geq n + (i-1)k$ for $1 \leq i \leq p$. It follows that $D([\mathbf{u}_i, \mathbf{u}_j]) \geq 2n + k$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq p$. Let $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{R})$, let $\overline{\mathcal{N}} = \mathcal{N}/\mathcal{N}_{n+(p-1)k+p}$, and let $\overline{\mathbf{f}}$, $\overline{\mathbf{g}}$, $\overline{\mathbf{u}}_i$ denote the images of $\mathbf{f}$, $\mathbf{g}$, $\mathbf{u}_i$ in $\overline{\mathcal{N}}$. Since $n \geq (p-1)k + p$ we have $2n + k \geq n + (p-1)k + p$. Therefore $\overline{\mathbf{u}}_i$ commutes with $\overline{\mathbf{u}}_j$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq p$. Using the formula $\mathbf{u}_i\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{f}\mathbf{u}_i\mathbf{u}_{i+1}$ we get

$$\overline{\mathbf{g}}^p = \overline{\mathbf{f}}^p\overline{\mathbf{u}}_1^{C(p,1)}\overline{\mathbf{u}}_2^{C(p,2)} \ldots \overline{\mathbf{u}}_p^{C(p,p)}, \tag{18}$$

where $C(p,i) = p!/i!(p-i)!$ is the binomial coefficient. It follows from Lemma 5 that

$$D(\mathbf{u}_i^p) \geq pn \geq n + (p-1)k + p. \tag{19}$$

Since $p \mid C(p,i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq p-1$, this implies $\overline{\mathbf{u}}_i^{C(p,i)} = 1$, and hence $\overline{\mathbf{g}}^p = \overline{\mathbf{f}}^p\overline{\mathbf{u}}_p$. To prove Theorem 1 for $n \geq (p-1)k + p$ it suffices to show that $D(\mathbf{u}_p) \geq n + (p-1)k + e(k,n)$, and that there is a specialization $\sigma : \mathcal{R} \to \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $D(\mathbf{u}_p^\sigma) = n + (p-1)k + e(k,n)$.

Case 2 *Theorem 1 holds if $n \geq (p-1)k + p$ and $p \mid k$.*

Proof: If $p \nmid n$ then an inductive argument based on Lemma 6 shows that $D(\mathbf{u}_p) = n + (p-1)k$. If $p \mid n$ then it follows from Lemma 6 that $D(\mathbf{u}_2) \geq n + k + 1$, and hence that $D(\mathbf{u}_p) \geq n + (p-1)k + 1$. This proves Theorem 1(a). If $p \nmid n$ let σ be a specialization such that $D(\mathbf{f}^\sigma) = k$ and $D(\mathbf{u}_1^\sigma) = n$. Then by Lemma 6 we have $D(\mathbf{u}_p) = n + (p-1)k$, which proves Theorem 1(b) in this case. If $p \mid n$ let σ be a specialization such that $D(\mathbf{f}^\sigma) = k$ and $D(\mathbf{u}_1^\sigma) = n + 1$. Using Lemma 6 we get

$$\begin{aligned} D(\mathbf{u}_p^\sigma) &= n + (p-1)k + 1 && (20)\\ &= n + (p-1)k + e(k,n) && (21)\\ &= (n+1) + (p-1)k + e(k,n+1). && (22) \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 1(b) now follows from Lemma 4. □

Since $\mathbf{u}_1$ and $\mathbf{f}$ are generic one might expect that $D(\mathbf{u}_{i+1}) = D(\mathbf{u}_i) + D(\mathbf{f}) + 1$ when $D(\mathbf{u}_i) \equiv D(\mathbf{f}) \pmod p$. In fact this is not always the case: There are instances where $D(\mathbf{u}_{i+1}) > D(\mathbf{u}_i) + D(\mathbf{f}) + 1$. To compute $D(\mathbf{u}_p)$ when $p \nmid k$, we introduce a doubly-indexed sequence (c_{ij}) which is closely related to the coefficients of $\mathbf{u}_h(x)$. We retain the variables $r_k, r_{k+1}, r_{k+2}, \ldots$ and introduce a new variable K. For $i, j \geq 0$ we define $c_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}[K, r_k, r_{k+1}, \ldots]$ using the difference equation

$$c_{ij} = \sum_{t=0}^{j} \left((i-2)K + n + 2t - j\right) r_{k+j-t} c_{i-1,t} \tag{23}$$

for $i \geq 1$, $j \geq 0$, and the initial conditions

$$c_{0j} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j = 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } j \geq 1. \end{cases} \tag{24}$$

Let $S = \mathbb{Q}(K)[r_k^{-1}, r_k, r_{k+1}, r_{k+2}, \ldots]$, and for $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $i \geq 0$ define

$$P_a(i) = \prod_{h=1}^{i} \left((h-2)K + n + a\right) \in \mathbb{Z}[K]. \tag{25}$$

Lemma 7 *There are* $\phi_{jab} \in S$ *such that for all* $i, j \geq 0$ *we have*

$$c_{ij} = r_k^i \cdot \sum_{a=0}^{j} \sum_{b=0}^{j} \phi_{jab} P_a(i+b). \tag{26}$$

Proof: We use induction on j. It follows from (23) and (24) that $c_{i0} = r_k^i P_0(i)$. Thus by setting $\phi_{000} = 1$ we get the lemma in the case $j = 0$. Let $j \geq 1$ and assume that the lemma holds for all c_{it} with $i \geq 0$ and $0 \leq t < j$. Then for $i \geq 1$ and $0 \leq t < j$ we have

$$c_{i-1,t} = r_k^{i-1} \cdot \sum_{a=0}^{t} \sum_{b=0}^{t} \phi_{tab} P_a(i-1+b), \tag{27}$$

with $\phi_{tab} \in S$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} &((i-2)K + n + 2t - j) P_a(i-1+b) = \\ &\qquad P_a(i+b) + (-bK + 2t - j - a) P_a(i-1+b), \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

by substituting (27) into the difference equation (23) we get

$$c_{ij} = \left((i-2)K + n + j\right) r_k c_{i-1,j} + r_k^{i-1} \cdot \sum_{t=0}^{j-1} \sum_{a=0}^{t} \sum_{b=0}^{t+1} \psi_{tab} P_a(i-1+b), \tag{29}$$

where

$$\psi_{tab} = \begin{cases} (2t-j-a)r_{k+j-t}\phi_{ta0} & \text{if } b=0, \\ (-bK+2t-j-a)r_{k+j-t}\phi_{tab} + r_{k+j-t}\phi_{t,a,b-1} & \text{if } 1 \le b \le t, \\ r_{k+j-t}\phi_{tat} & \text{if } b = t+1. \end{cases} \tag{30}$$

The general solution to (29) as a difference equation in i is

$$c_{ij} = \alpha r_k^i P_j(i) + r_k^{i-1} \cdot \sum_{t=0}^{j-1} \sum_{a=0}^{t} \sum_{b=0}^{t+1} \frac{\psi_{tab}}{bK+a-j} P_a(i+b), \tag{31}$$

with α arbitrary. For $0 \le a < j$, $0 \le b \le j$ set

$$\phi_{jab} = r_k^{-1} \cdot \sum_{t=c}^{j-1} \frac{\psi_{tab}}{bK+a-j}, \tag{32}$$

where $c = \max\{a, b-1\}$. Then for $0 \le a < b \le j$ we have

$$\phi_{jab} = \frac{\phi_{b-1,a,b-1}}{bK+a-j} r_{k+j-b+1} r_k^{-1} + \sum_{t=b}^{j-1} \frac{(-bK+2t-j-a)\phi_{tab} + \phi_{t,a,b-1}}{bK+a-j} r_{k+j-t} r_k^{-1}, \tag{33}$$

for $1 \le b \le a < j$ we have

$$\phi_{jab} = \sum_{t=a}^{j-1} \frac{(-bK+2t-j-a)\phi_{tab} + \phi_{t,a,b-1}}{bK+a-j} r_{k+j-t} r_k^{-1}, \tag{34}$$

and for $0 \le a < j$, $b = 0$ we have

$$\phi_{ja0} = \sum_{t=0}^{j-1} \frac{(2t-j-a)\phi_{ta0}}{a-j} r_{k+j-t} r_k^{-1}. \tag{35}$$

It follows that (31) can be rewritten as

$$c_{ij} = \phi_{jj0} r_k^i P_j(i) + r_k^i \cdot \sum_{a=0}^{j-1} \sum_{b=0}^{j} \phi_{jab} P_a(i+b), \tag{36}$$

where the value of $\phi_{jj0} = \alpha$ is determined by the initial conditions (24) to be

$$\phi_{jj0} = -\sum_{a=0}^{j-1} \sum_{b=0}^{j} \phi_{jab} P_a(b). \tag{37}$$

Finally, set $\phi_{jjb} = 0$ for $1 \le b \le j$. Then c_{ij} is given by (26). Since $\phi_{tab} \in S$ for $0 \le t < j$, it follows from (33), (34), and (35) that $\phi_{jab} \in S$ for $0 \le a < j$ and $0 \le b \le j$.

Hence by (37) we have $\phi_{jj0} \in S$ as well. Thus all the coefficients ϕ_{jab} in (26) lie in S, so the lemma holds for j. $\square$

In the proof of Lemma 7 we define ϕ_{jab} for all (j, a, b) such that $0 \leq a, b \leq j$. Set $\phi_{jab} = 0$ for all other integer values of j, a, b. Then by (33), (34), and (35) we have

$$\sum_{t=a}^{j} (bK + j + a - 2t) r_{k+j-t} \phi_{tab} = \sum_{t=a}^{j-1} r_{k+j-t} \phi_{t,a,b-1} \tag{38}$$

for $j \geq a \geq 0$, $b \geq 0$. Shifting j and t by a gives

$$\sum_{t=0}^{j} (bK + j - 2t) r_{k+j-t} \phi_{t+a,a,b} = \sum_{t=0}^{j-1} r_{k+j-t} \phi_{t+a,a,b-1} \tag{39}$$

for j, a, b nonnegative.

From (33) and (34) we would expect the denominator of ϕ_{jab} to contain the factor $bK + a - j$. Surprisingly, this factor is not present unless $b \mid a - j$. For $l, m \geq 0$ define a subring of S,

$$S_{lm} = \mathbb{Z}\left[\frac{1}{l!}, K, \frac{1}{K-1}, \frac{1}{K-2}, \ldots, \frac{1}{K-m}, r_k^{-1}, r_k, r_{k+1}, r_{k+2}, \ldots\right]. \tag{40}$$

If $l \leq l'$ and $m \leq m'$ then clearly $S_{lm} \subset S_{l'm'}$. For each (j, a, b) we will find (l, m) such that $\phi_{jab} \in S_{lm}$. To accomplish this we fix a and find the generating function for (ϕ_{jab}).

Proposition 8 *Let $a \geq 0$. The ordinary generating function for $(\phi_{jab})_{j,b\geq 0}$ is*

$$F_a(x, y) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{b=0}^{\infty} \phi_{jab} x^j y^b = \phi_{aa0} r_k^{-1} x^a \alpha(x) e^{\omega(x) y}, \tag{41}$$

where $\alpha(x) = r_k + r_{k+1}x + r_{k+2}x^2 + \cdots$, $\dfrac{r_k}{\alpha(x)} = 1 + q_1 x + q_2 x^2 + \cdots$, and

$$\omega(x) = \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \frac{q_t}{t - K} x^t. \tag{42}$$

Proof: When $a = 0$ the difference equation (39) is equivalent to the partial differential equation

$$\left(Ky\frac{\partial}{\partial y} + x\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)\big(F_0(x, y)\alpha(x)\big) - 2x\alpha(x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x}F_0(x, y) = yF_0(x, y)\left(\alpha(x) - r_k\right). \tag{43}$$

In addition, since $\phi_{000} = 1$ and $\phi_{00b} = 0$ for $b \geq 1$, we have the boundary condition $F_0(0, y) = 1$. The solution to this boundary value problem is easily determined by the method of characteristics to be the function given in (41), with $a = 0$. Alternatively, one can use the formula

$$x\omega'(x) - K\omega(x) = \frac{r_k}{\alpha(x)} - 1 \tag{44}$$

to check directly that this function is the unique solution. For $a \geq 1$, the sequence $(\phi_{j+a,a,b})_{j,b\geq 0}$ satisfies the same linear difference equation (39) as $(\phi_{j0b})_{j,b\geq 0}$, and we have $\phi_{aab} = 0$ for $b \geq 1$. Therefore the generating function for $(\phi_{j+a,a,b})_{j,b\geq 0}$ is $\phi_{aa0}F_0(x,y)$. Since $\phi_{jab} = 0$ for $j < a$, this implies that the generating function for $(\phi_{jab})_{j,b\geq 0}$ is $F_a(x,y) = \phi_{aa0}x^a F_0(x,y)$. □

Corollary 9 *Let j, a, b be nonnegative. If $a + b > j$ then $\phi_{jab} = 0$. If $a + b \leq j$ then $\phi_{jab} \in S_{lm}$, where $l = \max\{a, b\}$, $m = a$ if $b = 0$, and $m = \max\{a, j + 1 - a - b\}$ if $b \geq 1$.*

Proof: We first consider the case $a = 0$. By Proposition 8 we see that ϕ_{j0b} is the coefficient of x^j in

$$r_k^{-1}\alpha(x) \cdot \frac{1}{b!} \cdot \omega(x)^b = \frac{r_k^{-1}x^b}{b!}(r_k + r_{k+1}x + \cdots) \cdot \left(\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \frac{q_t}{t-K} x^{t-1}\right)^b. \tag{45}$$

It follows easily from this observation that ϕ_{j00} lies in S_{00}, ϕ_{j0b} lies in $S_{b,j+1-b}$ for $1 \leq b \leq j$, and $\phi_{j0b} = 0$ for $b > j$. We next use induction to show that $\phi_{jj0} \in S_{jj}$ for $j \geq 0$. Since $\phi_{000} = 1$, the case $j = 0$ is clear. Let $j \geq 1$ and suppose $\phi_{aa0} \in S_{aa}$ for all $0 \leq a < j$. By Proposition 8 we have $\phi_{jab} = \phi_{aa0}\phi_{j-a,0,b}$, so (37) can be rewritten as

$$\phi_{jj0} = -\sum_{a=0}^{j-1}\sum_{b=0}^{j} \phi_{aa0}\phi_{j-a,0,b}P_a(b). \tag{46}$$

By the inductive assumption we have $\phi_{aa0} \in S_{aa}$, and it follows from the first case that $\phi_{j-a,0,b} \in S_{jj}$ for $0 \leq a \leq j-1$, $0 \leq b \leq j$. Therefore all the terms of (46) are in S_{jj}, so we get $\phi_{jj0} \in S_{jj}$. The general case of the corollary now follows from the formula $\phi_{jab} = \phi_{aa0}\phi_{j-a,0,b}$. □

Corollary 10 *View ϕ_{jab} as a rational function of K. Then for each $j \geq 1$, ϕ_{j01} has a simple pole at $K = j$ with residue $-q_j$.*

Proof: Using (45) we get

$$\phi_{j01} = \frac{r_k^{-1}r_{k+j-1}q_1}{1-K} + \frac{r_k^{-1}r_{k+j-2}q_2}{2-K} + \cdots + \frac{r_k^{-1}r_k q_j}{j-K}. \tag{47}$$

The corollary now follows from the fact that $q_j \neq 0$. □

We now use Corollaries 9 and 10 to prove Theorem 1 in the cases where $p \nmid k$ and $n \geq (p-1)k + p$. Set $e = e(k,n)$ and let $A_h \in \mathrm{M}_{(e+1)\times(e+1)}(\mathcal{R})$ be the upper triangular matrix whose (i,j) entry for $0 \leq i \leq j \leq e(k,n)$ is

$$a_{hij} = ((h-2)k + n + 2i - j)r_{k+j-i}. \tag{48}$$

Then we have

$$A_h = \begin{bmatrix} n_h r_k & (n_h-1)r_{k+1} & (n_h-2)r_{k+2} & \dots & (n_h-e)r_{k+e} \\ 0 & (n_h+1)r_k & n_h r_{k+1} & \dots & (n_h-e+2)r_{k+e-1} \\ 0 & 0 & (n_h+2)r_k & \dots & (n_h-e+4)r_{k+e-2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & (n_h+e)r_k \end{bmatrix}, \tag{49}$$

where $n_h = (h-2)k+n$. For $1 \le h \le p$ let $\vec{v}_h \in \mathcal{R}^{e+1}$ be the row vector whose entries are the coefficients of $x^{(h-1)k+n+1}, x^{(h-1)k+n+2}, \dots, x^{(h-1)k+n+e+1}$ in $\mathbf{u}_h(x)$.

Lemma 11 *If $e(k,n) < k$ then $\vec{v}_{h+1} = \vec{v}_h A_h$.*

Proof: Write $\mathbf{f}(x) = x + x^{k+1}\alpha(x)$ and $\mathbf{u}_h(x) = x + x^{(h-1)k+n+1}\beta(x)$. Then we have the following expansions modulo $x^{(h+1)k+n+1}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{u}_h(\mathbf{f}(x)) \equiv x + x^{k+1}\alpha(x) + x^{(h-1)k+n+1}\beta(x) + \\ ((h-1)k+n+1)x^{hk+n+1}\alpha(x)\beta(x) + x^{hk+n+2}\alpha(x)\beta'(x)\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}_h(x)) \equiv x + x^{k+1}\alpha(x) + x^{(h-1)k+n+1}\beta(x) + \\ (k+1)x^{hk+n+1}\alpha(x)\beta(x) + x^{hk+n+2}\alpha'(x)\beta(x)\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

$$\begin{aligned}[\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{f}](x) \equiv x + ((h-2)k+n)x^{hk+n+1}\alpha(x)\beta(x) + \\ x^{hk+n+2}(\alpha(x)\beta'(x) - \alpha'(x)\beta(x)).\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

We have $\alpha(x) = r_k + r_{k+1}x + r_{k+2}x^2 + \cdots$, and we can write $\beta(x) = t_0 + t_1 x + t_2 x^2 + \cdots$ with $t_i \in \mathcal{R}$. Since $e(k,n) \le k-1$, it follows from (52) that for $0 \le j \le e(k,n)$ the coefficient of $x^{hk+n+j+1}$ in $\mathbf{u}_{h+1}(x) = [\mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{f}](x)$ is

$$\sum_{i=0}^{j} ((h-2)k+n+2i-j)r_{k+j-i}t_i. \tag{53}$$

Comparing this expression with (49) gives the lemma. □

Case 3 *Theorem 1 holds if $n \ge (p-1)k+p$, $p \nmid k$, and $e(k,n) < k$.*

Proof: For $h \ge 1$ define a matrix $\Pi_h \in \mathrm{M}_{(e+1)\times(e+1)}(\mathcal{R})$ by setting $\Pi_h = A_1 A_2 \dots A_h$. It follows from Lemma 11 that $\vec{v}_p = \vec{v}_1 \Pi_{p-1}$, where $\vec{v}_1 = (s_n, s_{n+1}, \dots, s_{n+e})$ has entries which are independent variables in $\mathcal{R}$ which don't occur in Π_{p-1}. Thus to prove Theorem 1 in this case it suffices to show that the first $e(k,n)$ columns of Π_{p-1} are all zero, and that there is a specialization $\sigma : \mathcal{R} \to \mathbb{F}_p$ which maps the last column of Π_{p-1} to a nonzero element of $\mathbb{F}_p^{e+1}$. We indicate the dependence of A_h on n by writing

$A_h = A_h(n)$ and $a_{hij} = a_{hij}(n)$. We also let $\pi_{hij} = \pi_{hij}(n)$ denote the (i,j) entry of Π_h. If $0 \le i \le j \le e(k,n)$ then $e(k,n+i) \ge e(k,n) - i$, so $a_{h,0,j-i}(n+i)$ is defined. By (48) we have $a_{hij}(n) = a_{h,0,j-i}(n+i)$ for $0 \le i \le j \le e$, and an inductive argument shows then that $\pi_{hij}(n) = \pi_{h,0,j-i}(n+i)$. If $j < e(k,n)$ then $j - i < e(k,n+i)$. Therefore it will suffice to prove the following statements for all $n \ge (p-1)k + p$:

$$\pi_{p-1,0,j}(n) = 0 \text{ for all } 0 \le j < e(k,n), \tag{54}$$

$$\sigma(\pi_{p-1,i,e}(n)) \ne 0 \text{ for some } 0 \le i \le e(k,n) \text{ and some specialization } \sigma. \tag{55}$$

There is a natural map $\rho : \mathbb{Z}[K, r_k, r_{k+1}, \ldots] \to \mathcal{R}$ which takes K to the image of k in $\mathcal{R}$. We denote this map by $x \mapsto \overline{x}$. Since $\Pi_h = \Pi_{h-1}A_h$, the sequence (π_{h0j}) satisfies the difference equation

$$\pi_{h0j} = \sum_{t=0}^{j} \left((h-2)k + n + 2t - j\right) r_{k+j-t}\pi_{h-1,0,t} \tag{56}$$

for $h \ge 1$, and the initial conditions

$$\pi_{00j} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j = 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } j \ge 1. \end{cases} \tag{57}$$

Comparing (56) and (57) with (23) and (24), we see that $\pi_{h0j} = \overline{c}_{hj}$ for all h, j such that $h \ge 0$ and $0 \le j \le e(k,n)$. For $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $h \ge 0$ let $\overline{P}_a(h) = \prod_{i=1}^{h}\left((i-2)k + n + a\right)$ denote the image of $P_a(h)$ in $\mathcal{R}$. Since $p \nmid k$ we have $\overline{P}_a(p-1+b) = 0$ for $b \ge 1$, and $\overline{P}_a(p-1) \ne 0$ if and only if $n \equiv 2k - a \pmod{p}$. Suppose $0 \le j < e(k,n)$. Then by Corollary 9 we have $\phi_{jab} \in S_{p-1,k_0-1}$ for all $a, b \ge 0$. Since $k_0 < p$ the reduction map ρ extends to a map $\tilde{\rho} : S_{p-1,k_0-1} \to \mathcal{R}[r_k^{-1}]$. Applying $\tilde{\rho}$ to (26) we get

$$\pi_{p-1,0,j} = r_k^{p-1} \cdot \sum_{a=0}^{j}\sum_{b=0}^{j} \overline{\phi}_{jab}\overline{P}_a(p-1+b). \tag{58}$$

The terms $\overline{P}_a(p-1+b)$ in the sum are all zero, except those with $b = 0$ and $n \equiv 2k - a \pmod{p}$. In this case we would have $a = e(k,n)$, which contradicts the assumption $j < e(k,n)$. Thus $\pi_{p-1,0,j} = 0$ for $0 \le j < e(k,n)$, which proves (54).

To prove (55), we first observe that if $n \equiv 2k - i \pmod{p}$ for some $0 \le i \le k_0$ then $e(k,n) = i$ and $\pi_{p-1,e,e} = \overline{P}_e(p-1)r_k^{p-1} \ne 0$. Hence $\sigma(\pi_{p-1,e,e}) = \overline{P}_e(p-1) \ne 0$ for any $\sigma : \mathcal{R} \to \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $\sigma(r_k) = 1$. If $n \not\equiv 2k - i \pmod{p}$ for all $0 \le i \le k_0$ then $e(k,n) = k_0$. By Lemma 7 we have

$$c_{p-1,k_0} = r_k^{p-1} \cdot \sum_{a=0}^{k_0}\sum_{b=0}^{k_0} \phi_{k_0ab}P_a(p-1+b). \tag{59}$$

We will show that all but two of the terms in (59) have image zero under $\tilde{\rho}$. Let $0 \le a, b \le k_0$ be such that $(a,b) \ne (0,1)$ and $(a,b) \ne (k_0, 0)$. Then $\overline{P}_a(p-1+b) = 0$, and by Corollary 9 we have $\phi_{k_0ab} \in S_{p-1,k_0-1}$. Therefore $\overline{\phi}_{k_0ab} = \tilde{\rho}(\phi_{k_0ab})$ is defined and $\overline{\phi}_{k_0ab}\overline{P}_a(p-1+b) = 0$.

It remains to consider the terms $\phi_{k_001}P_0(p)$ and $\phi_{k_0k_00}P_{k_0}(p-1)$ in (59). It follows from (37) and the previous paragraph that $\phi_{k_0k_00} = -\phi_{k_001}P_0(1) + \gamma$ for some $\gamma \in S_{p-1,k_0-1}$. Therefore we have

$$\phi_{k_001}P_0(p) + \phi_{k_0k_00}P_{k_0}(p-1) = \phi_{k_001}(P_0(p) - P_0(1)P_{k_0}(p-1)) + \gamma P_{k_0}(p-1). \tag{60}$$

We wish to expand (60) in powers of $K - k_0$. Let $Q = \prod_{i=1}^{p}((i-2)k_0 + n) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then we have the following expansions modulo $(K-k_0)^2$:

$$P_0(p) \equiv Q + Q \cdot \left(\frac{-1}{-k_0+n} + \sum_{h=0}^{p-2} \frac{h}{hk_0+n}\right)(K-k_0) \tag{61}$$

$$P_0(1)P_{k_0}(p-1) \equiv Q + Q \cdot \left(\frac{-1}{-k_0+n} + \sum_{h=0}^{p-2} \frac{h-1}{hk_0+n}\right)(K-k_0) \tag{62}$$

$$P_0(p) - P_0(1)P_{k_0}(p-1) \equiv \left(\sum_{h=0}^{p-2} \frac{Q}{hk_0+n}\right)(K-k_0). \tag{63}$$

Since $p \nmid k_0$ and $n \not\equiv k_0 \pmod{p}$, there is a unique $0 \le h_0 \le p-2$ such that $p \mid h_0k_0+n$. Then $Q' = Q/(h_0k_0+n) \in \mathbb{Z}$ is the unique term of the sum in (63) which is not divisible by p. Since $\overline{P}_{k_0}(p-1) = 0$, it follows from Corollary 10 that the image of (60) in $\mathcal{R}$ is $-\overline{Q}'\overline{q}_{k_0}$. Therefore by (59) we get $\pi_{p-1,0,k_0} = \overline{c}_{p-1,k_0} = -\overline{Q}'r_k^{p-1}\overline{q}_{k_0}$, with $\overline{Q}' \in \mathbb{F}_p^\times$. Let $\sigma : \mathcal{R} \to \mathbb{F}_p$ be a specialization such that $\sigma(r_i) = 0$ for $k < i < k+k_0$. Then $\sigma(r_k^{p-1}\overline{q}_{k_0}) = -\sigma(r_k^{p-2}r_{k+k_0})$, so by choosing σ so that $\sigma(r_k) = \sigma(r_{k+k_0}) = 1$ we get $\sigma(\pi_{p-1,0,k_0}) = \overline{Q}' \neq 0$. This proves (55). $\square$

Case 4 *Theorem 1 holds if $n \ge (p-1)k + p$, $p \nmid k$, and $e(k,n) \ge k$.*

Proof: If $e(k,n) \ge k$ then $e(k,n) = k = k_0$. To compute the necessary coefficients of $\mathbf{u}_h(x)$ we need to consider the expansions (50)–(52) modulo $x^{(h+1)k+n+2}$. In this higher-order expansion (50) and (52) acquire the additional term

$$\binom{(h-1)k+n+1}{2} x^{(h+1)k+n+1}\alpha(x)^2\beta(x). \tag{64}$$

To account for this extra term the matrix A_h must be replaced by the upper triangular matrix $A'_h \in \mathrm{M}_{(k+1)\times(k+1)}(\mathcal{R})$ whose (i,j) entry for $0 \le i,j \le k$ is

$$a'_{hij} = \begin{cases} a_{h0k} + \binom{(h-1)k+n+1}{2} r_k^2 & \text{if } (i,j) = (0,k), \\ a_{hij} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{65}$$

Consequently, Π_h is replaced by $\Pi'_h = A'_1A'_2\ldots A'_h$. An easy computation shows that there is $m \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that

$$\pi'_{p-1,i,j} = \begin{cases} \pi_{p-1,0,k} + mr_k^p & \text{if } (i,j) = (0,k), \\ \pi_{p-1,i,j} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{66}$$

Thus the first k columns of Π'_{p-1} are the same as those of Π_{p-1}. It follows by the reasoning in Case 3 that the first k columns of Π'_{p-1} are zero, and hence that Theorem 1(a) holds in this case. If $n \equiv 2k - i \pmod p$ for some $0 \le i \le k$ then $\pi'_{p-1,k,k} = \pi_{p-1,k,k}$, so there is a specialization σ such that $\sigma(\pi'_{p-1,k,k}) = \sigma(\pi_{p-1,k,k}) \ne 0$ as in Case 3. If $n \not\equiv 2k - i \pmod p$ for all $0 \le i \le k$ then $\pi'_{p-1,0,k} = -\overline{Q}' r_k^{p-1}\overline{q}_k + mr_k^p$. Let σ be a specialization such that $\sigma(r_i) = 0$ for $k < i < 2k$. As in Case 3 we have $\sigma(r_k^{p-1}\overline{q}_{k_0}) = -\sigma(r_k^{p-2}r_{2k})$, and hence $\sigma(\pi'_{p-1,0,k}) = \overline{Q}'\sigma(r_k^{p-2}r_{2k}) + m\sigma(r_k^p)$. By choosing σ so that $\sigma(r_k) = 1$ and $\sigma(r_{2k})$ is either 0 or 1 we get $\sigma(\pi'_{p-1,k,k}) \ne 0$. Therefore Theorem 1(b) holds in this case. $\square$

In Case 1 we proved Theorem 1 for $n \le k + k_0$, and in Cases 2, 3, 4 we proved Theorem 1 for $n \ge (p-1)k + p$. It remains to prove Theorem 1 for intermediate values of n. Recall that $\mathbf{f}(x) = x + r_k x^{k+1} + r_{k+1}x^{k+2} + \cdots \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{R})$. The map $T_{\mathbf{f}} : \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{R}) \to \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{R})$ defined by $T_{\mathbf{f}}(h(x)) = h(\mathbf{f}(x))$ induces a linear transformation on coefficient vectors $(1, a_1, a_2, \ldots)$ of elements of $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{R})$ (see [2]). This linear transformation can be represented by right multiplication by an infinite matrix of the form $I + M$, where I is the identity and M is an upper triangular matrix whose diagonal entries are all 0. The rows and columns of I and M are indexed by positive integers, and for $1 \le i < j$ the (i, j) entry of M is

$$m_{ij} = \sum_{l_1+\cdots+l_i=j-i} r_{l_1}r_{l_2}\ldots r_{l_i}, \tag{67}$$

where by convention we set $r_0 = 1$ and $r_l = 0$ for $1 \le l < k$. In particular, we have $m_{ij} = 0$ for $j - i < k$. The formula (67) may be rewritten as

$$m_{ij} = \sum \binom{i}{n_0, n_k, n_{k+1}\ldots, n_{j-i}} r_k^{n_k} r_{k+1}^{n_{k+1}} \ldots r_{j-i}^{n_{j-i}}, \tag{68}$$

where the sum is taken over nonnegative integers $n_0, n_k, n_{k+1}, \ldots, n_{j-i}$ such that

$$n_0 + n_k + n_{k+1} + \cdots + n_{j-i} = i \tag{69}$$

$$kn_k + (k+1)n_{k+1} + \cdots + (j-i)n_{j-i} = j - i. \tag{70}$$

For $h \ge 2$ the (i, j) entry of M^h can be expressed in terms of the m_{ij}:

$$m_{ij}^{(h)} = \sum_{i<b_1<\cdots<b_{h-1}<j} m_{ib_1}m_{b_1b_2}\ldots m_{b_{h-1}j}. \tag{71}$$

This formula allows us to compute the entries of the matrix $(I + M)^p = I + M^p$ which represents $\mathbf{f}^p$. We are particularly interested in $m_{1j}^{(p)}$, which for $j \ge 2$ is the coefficient of x^j in $\mathbf{f}^p(x)$.

Lemma 12 *Let d, i be positive integers such that $d < pk$ and $i \ge (d + 1 - k)/k$. Then* $m_{i,i+d} = m_{i+p,i+p+d}$.

Proof: Note that if $n_k, n_{k+1}, \ldots, n_d$ are nonnegative integers such that

$$kn_k + (k+1)n_{k+1} + \cdots + dn_d = d \tag{72}$$

then we have $n_k + n_{k+1} + \cdots + n_d \le d/k$. Since $i \ge (d+1-k)/k$ this implies

$$i - (n_k + n_{k+1} + \cdots + n_d) \ge \frac{d+1-k}{k} - \frac{d}{k} > -1. \tag{73}$$

It follows that $n_0 = i - (n_k + n_{k+1} + \cdots + n_d)$ is nonnegative. Hence by (68) we have

$$m_{i,i+d} = \sum \binom{i}{n_0, n_k, n_{k+1}, \ldots, n_d} r_k^{n_k} r_{k+1}^{n_{k+1}} \ldots r_d^{n_d}, \tag{74}$$

where the sum is taken over nonnegative $n_k, n_{k+1}, \ldots, n_d$ satisfying (72). For $k \le j \le d$ we have $jn_j \le d < pk \le pj$, and hence $n_j < p$. Therefore in characteristic p the multinomial coefficient

$$\binom{i}{n_0, n_k, n_{k+1}, \ldots, n_d} = \frac{i!}{n_0! n_k! n_{k+1}! \ldots n_d!} \tag{75}$$

$$= \frac{i(i-1)\ldots(i-(n_k + n_{k+1} + \cdots + n_d - 1))}{n_k! n_{k+1}! \ldots n_d!} \tag{76}$$

is unchanged if we replace i by $i+p$ and n_0 by $n_0 + p$. It follows that (74) is also unchanged if we replace i by $i+p$. □

Lemma 13 *Let $0 \le t < n$ and $i \ge 2$. Then there is a polynomial A with coefficients in $\mathbb{F}_p$ such that*

$$m_{i,i+n+t} = A(r_k, r_{k+1}, \ldots, r_{n-1}) + ir_{n+t} + i \cdot \sum_{w=0}^{t-k} r_{n+w} m_{i-1,i-1+t-w}. \tag{77}$$

Proof: We can write

$$m_{i,i+n+t} = \sum_{l_1 + \cdots + l_i = n+t} r_{l_1} r_{l_2} \ldots r_{l_i} \tag{78}$$

$$= A(r_k, r_{k+1}, \ldots, r_{n-1}) + B(r_k, r_{k+1}, \ldots, r_{n+t}), \tag{79}$$

where A is the sum of the terms which depend only on $r_k, r_{k+1}, \ldots, r_{n-1}$, and B is the sum of the remaining terms. Let $r_{l_1} r_{l_2} \ldots r_{l_i}$ be a term of B. Then $l_j \ge n$ for some j, so we have $l_j = n + w$ with $0 \le w \le t$. Furthermore, since $t < n$, we have $l_h < n$ for all $h \ne j$. Since there are i possible values for j we get

$$B(r_k, r_{k+1}, \ldots, r_{n+t}) = ir_{n+t} + i \cdot \sum_{w=0}^{t-1} r_{n+w} m_{i-1,i-1+t-w}. \tag{80}$$

Since $m_{i-1,i-1+t-w} = 0$ for $w > t-k$, the lemma follows. □

Proposition 14 *Let $s \geq 0$ satisfy $n > k + s$ and $pk > k + s$. Then the coefficient of $x^{1+s+n+(p-1)k}$ in $\mathbf{f}^p(x)$ can be written uniquely in the form*

$$m^{(p)}_{1,1+s+n+(p-1)k} = C_{ns} + E^{(0)}_{ns} r_n + E^{(1)}_{ns} r_{n+1} + \cdots + E^{(s)}_{ns} r_{n+s}, \tag{81}$$

with $C_{ns} \in \mathbb{F}_p[r_k, r_{k+1}, \ldots, r_{n-1}]$ and $E^{(w)}_{ns} \in \mathbb{F}_p[r_k, r_{k+1}, \ldots, r_{k+s-w}]$ for $0 \leq w \leq s$. Furthermore, we have $E^{(w)}_{n+p,s} = E^{(w)}_{ns}$.

Proof: Set $b_0 = 1$ and $b_p = 1 + s + n + (p-1)k$. By (71) we have

$$m^{(p)}_{1,1+s+n+(p-1)k} = \sum_{b_0 < b_1 < \cdots < b_p} m_{b_0 b_1} m_{b_1 b_2} \ldots m_{b_{p-1} b_p}. \tag{82}$$

To prove the first statement it suffices to show that each term in the sum (82) can be expressed in the form of (81), i. e.,

$$m_{b_0 b_1} m_{b_1 b_2} \ldots m_{b_{p-1} b_p} = c + e^{(0)} r_n + e^{(1)} r_{n+1} + \cdots + e^{(s)} r_{n+s}, \tag{83}$$

with $c \in \mathbb{F}_p[r_k, r_{k+1}, \ldots, r_{n-1}]$ and $e^{(w)} \in \mathbb{F}_p[r_k, r_{k+1}, \ldots, r_{k+s-w}]$. If $m_{b_0 b_1} m_{b_1 b_2} \ldots m_{b_{p-1} b_p}$ lies in $\mathbb{F}_p[r_k, r_{k+1}, \ldots, r_{n-1}]$ then this is clear. If $m_{b_0 b_1} m_{b_1 b_2} \ldots m_{b_{p-1} b_p}$ depends on r_h for some $h \geq n$ then $b_i - b_{i-1} \geq k$ for all $1 \leq i \leq p$ and $b_j - b_{j-1} = n + t$ for some $1 \leq j \leq p$ and $t \geq 0$. For $i \neq j$ we have $b_i - b_{i-1} \leq k + s - t$. Therefore $t \leq s$ and $m_{b_{i-1} b_i} \in \mathbb{F}_p[r_k, r_{k+1}, \ldots, r_{k+s-t}]$. If $j = 1$ then $b_{j-1} = b_0 = 1$, and hence $m_{b_0 b_1} = m_{1,1+n+t} = r_{n+t}$. In this case $m_{b_0 b_1} m_{b_1 b_2} \ldots m_{b_{p-1} b_p}$ can be written in the form (83) with $c = 0$, $e^{(t)} = m_{b_1 b_2} \ldots m_{b_{p-1} b_p}$, and $e^{(w)} = 0$ for all $w \neq t$. If $j \geq 2$ then $b_{j-1} \geq 2$, and hence $m_{b_{j-1} b_j}$ is given by Lemma 13. Therefore $m_{b_0 b_1} m_{b_1 b_2} \ldots m_{b_{p-1} b_p}$ can be written in the form (83), with $e^{(w)} = 0$ for all $w \neq t$ with $w > t - k$. It follows that $m^{(p)}_{1,1+s+n+(p-1)k}$ can be written in the form (81). The fact that C_{ns} and $E^{(w)}_{ns}$ are uniquely determined follows from the assumption $n > k + s$.

To prove the last statement we observe that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the terms of (82) which don't lie in $\mathbb{F}_p[r_k, r_{k+1}, \ldots, r_{n-1}]$ and the terms of the corresponding expansion of $m^{(p)}_{1,1+s+n+p+(p-1)k}$ which don't lie in $\mathbb{F}_p[r_k, r_{k+1}, \ldots, r_{n+p-1}]$. This correspondence is given by

$$m_{b_0 b_1} \ldots m_{b_{j-1} b_j} \ldots m_{b_{p-1} b_p} \longleftrightarrow m_{b_0 b_1} \ldots m_{b_{j-1}, b_j + p} \ldots m_{b_{p-1}+p, b_p + p}, \tag{84}$$

where j is determined by the condition $b_j - b_{j-1} \geq n$. Set $b_j - b_{j-1} = n + t$ as above. It follows from Lemma 13 that for $0 \leq w \leq t - k$ the coefficient of r_{n+w} in $m_{b_{j-1} b_j}$ and the coefficient of r_{n+p+w} in $m_{b_{j-1}, b_j + p}$ are both equal to $b_{j-1} m_{b_{j-1}-1, b_{j-1}-1+t-w}$, and that the coefficient of r_{n+t} in $m_{b_{j-1} b_j}$ and the coefficient of r_{n+p+t} in $m_{b_{j-1}, b_j + p}$ are both equal to b_{j-1}. In addition, since $pk > k + s$, Lemma 12 implies that $m_{b_{i-1} b_i} = m_{b_{i-1}+p, b_i + p}$ for $i > j$. It follows that $E^{(w)}_{n+p,s} = E^{(w)}_{ns}$ for $0 \leq w \leq s$. □

Case 5 *Theorem 1 holds if $k + k_0 < n < (p-1)k + p$.*

Proof: Choose n' such that $n' \equiv n \pmod{p}$ and $n' \geq (p-1)k + p$, and set $e = e(k,n) = e(k,n')$. It follows from Theorem 1(a) in Cases 2, 3, 4 and Remark 3 that $E_{n's}^{(w)} = 0$ for all s, w such that $0 \leq w \leq s < e$. It follows from Proposition 14 that $E_{ns}^{(w)} = 0$ for $0 \leq w \leq s < e$. Therefore by Remark 3 we see that Theorem 1(a) holds for n. It follows from Theorem 1(b) in Cases 2, 3, 4 that there is a specialization σ such that $\sigma(E_{n'e}^{(w)}) \neq 0$ for some $0 \leq w \leq e$. Using Proposition 14 we get $\sigma(E_{ne}^{(w)}) = \sigma(E_{n'e}^{(w)}) \neq 0$. Let $\tau : \mathcal{R} \to \mathbb{F}_p$ be a specialization such that $\tau(r_i) = \sigma(r_i)$ for $i \neq n + w$, and $\tau(r_{n+w}) \neq \sigma(r_{n+w})$. Since $\tau(E_{ne}^{(w)}) = \sigma(E_{ne}^{(w)}) \neq 0$, it follows from Proposition 14 that

$$D((\mathbf{f}^{\tau})^p(\mathbf{f}^{\sigma})^{-p}) = n + (p-1)k + e(k,n). \tag{85}$$

Therefore Theorem 1(b) holds for n. □

By combining Cases 1 through 5 we conclude that Theorem 1 holds for all $n \geq k \geq 1$.

Acknowledgment: I would like to thank Professor Charles Leedham-Green for asking whether Theorem 1(b) is true.

References

[1] R. Camina, The Nottingham group, appearing in *New Horizons in pro-p Groups*, pp. 205–221, Progr. Math. 184, Birkhäuser Boston, 2000.

[2] I. O. York, The exponent of certain finite p-groups, Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. **33** (1990), pp. 483–490.